Express Mail No. EV 540277039 US Date of Deposit: August 17, 2004

Attorney Docket No.: S431-J

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the specification, the paragraph beginning at page 5, line 18, the paragraph beginning at page 7, line 1, the paragraph beginning at page 10, line 1, and the paragraph beginning at page 17, line 1, have been amended to correct minor editorial problems.

Claims 1-9 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended.

Claims 4-6 have been withdrawn. Claims 8 and 9 have been added.

Claims 4-6 have been withdrawn as the result of an earlier restriction requirement.

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended to clarify the invention. In claims 1 and 7 certain language has been moved to or rearranged in the preamble for purposes of readability. It has been made clear that the recited steps are carried out at the web site of the web site operator. The last portion of original claim 7 has been recast as new dependent claim 8. Claim 9 recites the operator's control over the content on its web site.

In view of the examiner's earlier restriction requirement, applicant retains the right to present claim 7 in a divisional application.

The rejection of claims 1, 2, and 7 as anticipated by, and claim 3 as obvious in view of Capek 6,112,192 is respectfully traversed.

In Capek 6,112,192 the posting of content to an area on a web page is controlled by the internet access provider, not by the web site operator. The posted content does not appear on the web site of the web site operator. Different visitors to the same web Appl. No. 09/684,311 Amdt. dated August 17, 2004

Reply to Office action of March 3, 2004

Express Mail No. EV 540277039 US Date of Deposit: August 17, 2004

Attorney Docket No.: S431-J

site will see different content in the exact same area depending upon which internet

service providers those different visitors use. In Capek the web site operator is not

concerned with what the respective visitors see in that area so long as the advertising the

visitors see generates revenue for the web site operator. Where the web site operator

wants to be sure that each visitor to the web site sees the same thing in an area, the

Capek system is not acceptable. The present claims are directed to the invention where

the posting of content takes place on the web site of the web site operator. The content

of the web site, at least insofar as the part where the present invention is applied,

appears the same to every visitor that views it until the controlling content authority

changes it.

The references cited but not applied have been reviewed but are not believed to be

pertinent.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this

case.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUNTON & JAGGER

Bruce A. Jagger

Reg. No. 19,968

Tel.: (310) 846-4795

Brunton & Jagger Bruce A. Jagger 6100 Center Drive, Ste. 630 Los Angeles, CA 90045

416/S431-Amd

9